1: Titiev E-9 (1948) 1951 SC4 Araucanians SC4
Mapuche-Huilliche

THE ALLOTMENT PROGRAM, SINCE 1927

175
G49
•921

Unfortunately, from the viewpoint of the harassed Indians, they were yet to be faced with another difficult problem of adjustment—the transition from communally to privately owned land. At the time when reservations were first created by law, a property title (*título de merced*) was issued to each *cabal* who was the recognized head of a kinship group that lived together. It was stipulated, though, that at the request of one-eighth of its members, any reduction must be subdivided into individually-held parcels.[10] At first the natives opposed such subdivisions since the reservation grants usually included a bit of extra land for the common use of the group, but as time went on more and more pressure was exerted to have all reservation land assigned "in severalty to each individual of the kinship group, and to dispose of any remainder for white colonization."[11] An average of five to six hectares (about twelve to fifteen acres) was supposed to be allotted to each person. Where insufficient land was available, the government was expected to provide additional parcels from within its domain. Lothrop informed me that in 1930 some families near Temuco had only one hectare, and in 1937 Dugan estimated that between Quepe and Tolten the average Indian had only two and one-half hectares.[12] According to Lothrop, some poor families in 1930 were moving up the Andes and clearing the forests to make new farms, while others were living with relatives.

Despite the existence of a protective clause that forbade Indian owners to dispose of their parcels of land for a period of ten years, native leaders were not slow to realize how completely the new system of personal land ownership would break up what was left of their tribal unity. In 1930 they held a large congress in Boroa, at which they thoroughly discussed the problems that confronted them.[13] In the end they bowed to what ap-

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 312.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 311.
[12] Dugan, 1937, p. 13.
[13] Dr. Lothrop told of a congress that was held on Wednesday, December 25, 1929. Although it was a rainy day about four thousand people were

1: Titiev E-5 (1948) 1951 SG4 Araucanians SG4
Mapuche-Huilliche

peared inevitable and reluctantly admitted that the continued partitioning of their lands could not be stopped. Somewhat pathetically, these descendants of the great warriors of old asked only that the government should give them adequate legal protection. Dr. McBride, who was present at the congress, was moved to express himself in a vein of gloomy prophecy. "The abolition of their agrarian communities," he wrote, "is an important event in the history of Chile, representing the virtual extinction of the long-maintained Araucanian independence."[14]

There will be occasion to study some of the details of this process hereinafter.

present, with perhaps one thousand men on horseback forming a great circle during the speeches. The immediate cause of this congress was the dislodgement of Mapuches close to Temuco so that an airport could be built. Compensation was one hundred pesos, then amounting to $12.19.

[14] McBride, 1936, p. 313.

1: Titiev E-5 (1948) 1951 SG4 Araucanians SG4
Mapuche-Huilliche

621 626 however, were not necessarily in force throughout the entire tribal domain. And yet it cannot be said that the Mapuche lived in a state of anarchy.

621 592 Apparently, the principal weight of political authority ran along lines of kinship, and the unilocal household seems to have been the central element in the system. Each household comprised a localized and permanent succession of males, supplemented essentially by their wives and unmarried daughters. In the area south of the Cautín River the entire group, consisting of as many as eighty people, lived literally under a single roof;[35] north of the Cautín the unilocal arrangement was observed only in principle, inasmuch as three or four successive generations of men would build small, but independent *rukas* in close proximity to one another. These clusters are known as *lov*, *lof*, or *lofche*,[36] and in the aggregate their occupants comprise the same kin that lived in one large dwelling.

622 592 627 Each of the localized kinship groups was essentially autonomous when no major fighting was taking place. Normally, one of the oldest men held the position of chief, *loñko*, and at his death the office descended to his son, brother, or paternal nephew as the surviving men of the unit decided. It was the [421] chief who held at least nominal title to his group's land, and it was he who allotted parts for the use of particular followers.[37] His advice was sought on all occasions, and no man of his unilocal household or its equivalent could marry without his 622 592 627 consent. He was also expected to supervise payment of *llañkan* that involved his retainers. *Llañkan* was a form of restitution or wergild which had to be paid by a murderer to the survivors 681

[35] Latcham, 1924, p. 263. A description of a large unilocal household, with partitions separating the quarters assigned to a man's married sons, occurs in Smith, 1855, p. 295.

[36] It is interesting to speculate on the precise significance of these words. Augusta (1916, I: 116) translated *lof* as "break" or "collapse." I am tempted to think that the word applies to an aggregate of households that represents the breakdown of an older system of strictly unilocal residence. Latcham (1924, p. 263) used the word *lov* for these groups of structures.

[37] Cf. Smith, 1855, p. 241.

1: Titiev E-5 (1948) 1951 SG4 Araucanians SG4
Mapuche-Huilliche

They were his heralds or trusted messengers and were used particularly for carrying on negotiations with other head men. They had to have excellent memories in order to transmit messages precisely, and it was necessary for them to be good orators so that they could deliver their communications effectively.[46] They traveled in pairs to check the exactness of each other's statements, and in the hope that one of them could get through to a destination even if his partner were waylaid or killed. A clever *werken* was likely to be chosen to replace a deceased *loñko*, and it is altogether probable that service as a herald was considered the best training for a future chief.

The traditional system of chieftainship, whatever may have been its vicissitudes in times past, received a deathblow when the practice of allotting reservation lands in severalty began. At the beginning of the reservation period, when each recognized chief of a kinship unit (presumably a *lof*) was given a *título de merced* on behalf of his group, the position of *loñko* seemed to be strengthened. When, however, one reduction after another was subdivided and titles were distributed to particular landowners, chieftainship lost its main support. As more and more individuals acquired their own property, they tended to follow their own inclinations without seeking the advice of elders; and as more and more homesteads were built on separate land holdings, the older pattern of large unilocal residences disappeared. Furthermore, partly through government and missionary pressure, and partly because they no longer have a monopoly of wealth, chiefs cannot indulge in large-scale polygyny and can no longer hope to beget large numbers of followers. Such as it was, the old order of chieftainship is gone, and no new form of leadership has yet emerged.[47]

[46] Examples of the style in which *loñkos* and *werkens* spoke may be found in Augusta, 1934, pp. 9–13.

[47] Occasionally, a politically conscious Araucanian is a candidate for national office on a platform designed to win the support of his fellow tribesmen. A few Araucanian deputies have been elected, but rural natives regard them with suspicion.

3:Brand E-4 (no date)1941 SG4 Araucanians SG4

which provided for the placing of the Indians on *reducciones*, allotted in title to the chiefs representing the various family groups) led to the revolt of 1868-70. This culminated with the reduction of much of Araucanía, and the founding of a line of forts south of the Bío-Bío along the Río Malleco. However, during the War of the Pacific (1879-83) Chile moved most of her garrison troops north into Bolivia and Chile, and the Araucanians commenced their final revolt. The capitulation of Lima in 1881 released experienced and equipped soldiers who (1881-84) completely conquered Araucanía. The Araucanian capacity for resistance was definitely crushed by the cholera epidemic of 1886-87. A string of towns, such as Victoria and Temuco, 1881, were established along the north-south road between Angol and Puerto Montt; new laws were set up regarding the Araucanians and their lands in 1883; and the *Frontera* was incorporated in the national domain by the organization of the provinces of Malleco and Cautín in 1887. This ended the epic resistance of the Araucanians against Spanish and Chilean aggression that had lasted more than 340 years. During this period the main wars and insurrections were ten in number: War of initial conquest, 1598-1602, 1654-1655, 1723, 1766, 1813-1825, 1835, 1859, 1868-1870, and 1879-1884.

175
648

POPULATION

Now, thanks to disease (smallpox, phthisis, typhus, malaria, measles, cholera, etc.), alcoholism, and war, the Araucanians were at their nadir. In the succeeding years the land situation became somewhat stabilized; a subsistence and barter economy (based upon livestock, cereals, potatoes, fruits, lumber, textiles, silverwork, etc.) functioned; schools, new missions, hospitals, and improved lines of communication and transportation were established; and the Araucanian population began to increase.

164
165
421

The number of Araucanians living at various periods during the past 60 years has been a matter more of guessing than of counting. National censuses have been taken in Chile in 1835, 1843, 1854, 1865, 1875, 1885, 1895, 1907, 1920, 1930, and the last one in November of 1940. These censuses have been of varying reliability, but none made any real attempt to enumerate the Araucanians prior to that of 1895. Most of the estimates place the number of Araucanians in 1890 between 20,000 and 50,000. These were obviously wrong since the census of 1907 listed 101,000 and that of 1920 gave a total of 105,000 Araucanians. In the writings of both Chileans and foreigners during the past 20 years one most commonly encounters a statement such as "somewhat more than 100,000." The statements actually range from 40,000 (Pericot y García: *América Indígena*, 1936, p. 682) to 180,000 (Carlson: *Geography of Latin America*, 1936, p. 121). Although the details of the 1940 census have not been published as yet, the author was informed that the government recognized the existence of some 187,000 Araucanians. However, this number reflects upon the validity of the

161
[114]

5:Cooper E-4 (no date) 1946 SG4 Araucanians SG4

Nonpolitical social grouping.—The modern *Mapuche-Huilliche* are divided into three loosely separated classes: the wealthy, the unattached-commoners, and the poorer people working as peons on estates. Earlier, too, there was a similar loose triple division into: wealthy and caciques, commoners, and "slaves" and captives.

Personal rank and prestige was derived chiefly from martial prowess and from wealth; generous hospitality, and eloquence in speech were other well-recognized avenues to status.

There were no secret or other societies, and no formal organization of age classes. There is no tangible evidence of moieties; the term llaúcahuin, "la mitad de una regua," given by Luis de Valdivia (1887, s.v.) in his vocabulary, hardly constitutes such evidence, problematic though the meaning of the term be. There existed a type of "blood-brotherhood" (koncho), entered into by two men with a ceremonial giving and/or killing of a lamb or other animal (Félix José, 1916, 1:93, s.v. koncho; Moesbach, 1936, pp. 389–91). Other kinds of "brotherhood" were entered into between two men, two women, or a man and woman by drinking or eating together or by exchanging presents, and between two families or tribes by the more solemn ritual killing of a lamb and eating it together and by offering prayers. (Housse, 1939, p. 208–10; cf. Guevara Silva, 1908, p. 66; Havestadt, 1883, 2:691; Smith, 1855, pp. 260–62.)

ECONOMIC LIFE

Ownership.—Our earliest specific, albeit meager, information on land tenure is from the second half of the 18th century (Molina, 1901, pp. 122, 149; Gómez de Vidaurre, 1889, 14:341); later writers have added a little but not much. (Smith, 1855, pp. 240–41; Ruiz Aldea, 1902, pp. 15, 30; Guevara Silva, 1904, pp. 38–39; Bullock, 1911, p. 3; Latcham, 1922 b, pp. 412–13; Moesbach, 1936, p. 192; McBride, 1936, pp. 308–09.) If we piece together the scanty and incomplete data available, the following outlines emerge, though none too clearly: Each family or close-kinship group claimed a given territory which had been passed on to it from its ancestors, this territory being held jointly or communally by the family or group. Land not under actual cultivation or lying temporarily fallow was communally held. Each individual—or family—had exclusive rights of use to the land claimed as fallow or under cultivation by him, and to its products, and could transmit such land to his heir or heirs. According to Smith (1855, p. 241), only the headman could dispose by sale or otherwise of clan land to Indians who were not members of the community, but all selling of land to Whites was a capital crime. Each wife in polygynous households received her own garden plot from the husband (Ruiz Aldea, 1902, p. 30; cf. Moesbach, 1936, p. 192), and kept separately the products thereof; in addition, she owned her own chickens

5:Cooper E-4 (no date) 1946 SG4 Araucanians SG4

and livestock, which as a rule were not, or could not by right be, sold by her husband without her consent (Moesbach, ibid.). There is no trace among the *Araucanians* of the system of periodic allotment of gardening land that is found in some communities of the Highland of Bolivia and Perú and probably of the Piedmont of far northern Chile (McBride, 1936, pp. 309, 364).

Inheritance.—Here, too, information is late, meager, and lacking in detail. A man's property was inherited by his sons, according to Carvallo i Goyeneche (1876, p. 141). When an older man (father or other) was near death, all his blood kin came in together, and he distributed some of his property to each, and the residue to his children, or, if there were no children, to his brothers and other near blood kin (Havestadt, 1883, 2:621; Molina, 1901, p. 122). (On inheritance of wives, see supra under Marriage and Family.)

Exchange.—Barter by exchange of presents was common—the donor giving with the expectation of a return from the recipient. (Febrés, 1882, s.v. thûiln; Havestadt, 1883, pp. 616–17; Smith, 1855, pp. 258, 292.) Havestadt states (1883, 2:700) that llancas (llaŋkas) were used to purchase necessities as well as to compensate for murders, and Molina (1901, p. 184) reports a sort of conventional tariff of "payments" (kullin) consisting of a horse or bridle as "one payment," an ox as "two payments," etc, but a more specific currency was absent. Some plain barter, but not so much, was carried on by the *Mapuche-Huilliche* among themselves. They carried on a considerable "foreign" trade with, e.g., the *Puelche* for salt, bezoars, feathers, etc.; with the Spanish, selling ponchos and livestock for wine and miscellaneous merchandise. There were no established markets or market days, although Mariño de Lovera (1865, p. 124) states that the "public gardens," that is, the open grounds set aside and used for assemblies and feasts, served as places for buying and selling goods and women—incidentally, no doubt, to civic or social gatherings therein.

Labor.—Some kinds of work, such as constructing houses and sowing and harvesting, were done by voluntary communal or group labor. The individual would invite his kin and neighbors to help. No payment was made to them for their labor, but at the end he would usually provide a good feast with plenty of chicha, and he in turn would, of course, be expected to help when one of them had similar need.

To the man fell the tasks of felling trees and clearing the ground for gardens, attending cattle and horses, hunting, cutting wood, all woodworking, constructing huts, corrals and other enclosures, fishing and navigating, carrying on military activities, and making weapons and tools. The woman's work included cultivating the garden, preparing and cooking food, making fermented beverages, caring for the younger children, collecting wild plant foods, spinning, weaving of blankets and clothing, skin dressing, making pottery, and weaving basketry.

5:Cooper E-4 (no date) 1946 SG4 Araucanians SG4
Pehuenche

repeated almost word for word by Rosales (1877–78, 1:223, 468)—and which they stored in a manner to last 4 or 5 years. Whether they practiced any agriculture in Mariño de Lovera's time is uncertain from his account, while Rosales' two statements are not easily harmonized: "no cuidan de sembrar" (1:468), and "cogen sus trigos y zebadas [European? or the native *Araucanian* "cebada"?] con abundancia los Pegüenches, aunque son poco labradores y con muy poco que siembran se contentan" (1:192). Pietas (1846, pp. 499, 500) seems to imply that horticulture was absent. For the rest, climatic conditions in the upper Andes were not favorable to gardening.

The weapons used were the bow and arrow, and the bolas (Pietas, 1846, p. 499).

Dwellings were of hides of horses and cattle.

Rosales (1877–78, 1:198) alone records the use of a type of snowshoes made of "coleos" (*Chusquea* sp. probably) to prevent sinking in the deep snow, but gives no details on construction—the only occurrence of snowshoes reported for South America, to the writer's knowledge, except the *Ona* one.

Each *Pehuenche*, according to Rosales (1877–78, 1:197; see also Pietas, 1846, p. 500), had exclusive and hereditary rights to gather piñons in a given district—held, added Pietas, just as the Spaniards hold their own vineyards.

In the middle of the 18th century, the culture of the "*Pehuenche*" between lat. 34° and 37° S. was fundamentally like *Mapuche-Huilliche*, as is clear from Molina; still earlier in the same century, Pietas stated (1846, p. 499) that the "*Pehuenche*" farther south had "los mismos ritos y costumbres" as the *Huilliche;* for all we know, even in the 16th and 17th centuries, the culture of the *Pegüenche* of Rosales and of the piñon-eating mountaineers of Mariño de Lovera, apart from the few reported minor differences we have listed and, presumably, other nonreported ones, may have been fundamentally in conformity with the culture of the *Mapuche-Huilliche*. At any rate, we have no tangible evidence of fundamental difference of pattern.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

For bibliographic references on the *Mapuche-Huilliche*, see page 699; on the *Picunche*, page 755; on the Argentine *Araucanians*, pages 755–756; and on the *Pehuenche*, page 759.

8: Faron E-5 (1953) 1956 SG4 Araucanians SG4

174 611 Latcham may have been unduly influenced by a "pseudo-matriliny," which derives from short-term matrilocality. Evidence for this was found in 1953 near Toltén, and its occurrence in the past is attested to in oral tradition.

[167] Around the time of the reprisals following the rebellion of 1880–82, which seem to have been greater near Nueva Imperial than in the Toltén region, many Mapuche migrated southward, their departure generally entailing forfeiture of land rights. Thus landless, they settled and married in the Toltén region, living on the land of their fathers-in-law. According to Chilean law and Mapuche custom at the time of the reservation program, these married-in males had little or no legal claim to land in the new area. Today some of these in-marrying males who are still alive, and others who have migrated more recently, remark that they have only de facto control over their wife's land. They state, however, that their sons will inherit from them, and it is clear from family histories that in a generation or two this anomaly is eradicated and patrilineality prevails. Given the historical descriptions of Spanish-Araucanian warfare, this occurrence of temporary matrilocality may have taken place repeatedly.

611 174 421

601 582 In his discussion of Araucanian social organization, Titiev wrote that "the central features of Mapuche nomenclature are geared to the marriage practices" and that "greatest importance must be attributed to unilateral cross-cousin marriage" (1951:38). The marriage practices are indeed reflected in the kinship terminology, but one cannot agree that unilateral cross-cousin marriage is so revealed. Actually, marriage with MoBrDa is not indicated in the nomenclature. MoBrDa is terminologically identified with women on the parental generation and her children are often called "brother" and "sister" by Ego. What is therefore indicated is the "disputed" practice of marriage with WiBrDa (Titiev 1951:49; Hallowell 1943:490). Cross-cousin marriage attained dominance at a time when the cross-generational type was passing from the scene, along with the lagging of polygyny and leviratic obligations. That the terminology has not reflected the dominance of MoBrDa marriage is an indication of its generally late appearance as a preferential type.

According to Titiev (1951:49), Hallowell's recording of the "disputed" WiBrDa marriage hinges on an error in translation in which there was a failure to distinguish between WiBrDa and MoBrDa. As a rule, the wife term is not *ñuke* (as recorded by Titiev) but *kure* or *ñomo*, and from *kure* is derived the WiSi and WiBrDa term, *kurun*. If *ñuke* is used at all in reference to the wife it is in the combined form *ñuke kure*, a more descriptive term designating MoBrDa only after marriage. The writer never heard *ñuke* used for wife, and only obtained the information about *ñuke kure* after considerable probing. At any rate, it seems to exist only as a possible linguistic construction rather than as a term in even limited use. It does not appear in any of the historical sources used by the writer. Actually, there is little room for error in this matter of terminology. Hallowell got to the core of the situation in his discussion of marriage between Ego and *kurun* (WiSi and/or WiBrDa) (1943:491).

601 114 The study of Anselmo Raguileo (1953) should be mentioned because of the gross inaccuracy of his sketch map, which presents a distorted picture of

12: Faron E-4, 5 (1952-1954) 1964
SG4 Araucanians SG4
Mapuche

sons. It is directly from the father that all sons acquire lineage-based rights within the reservation community. These include the right to land and house site, the right to participate in political, economic, recreational, and ritual activities of the community. Today, these rights are more immediately invested in the household head, that is, the father-husband, than they seem to have been in the recent past. A few generations ago, the chief of a reservation took a more active role in deciding the apportionment of land, controlled political decisions, organized economic activities, gave or withheld permission to marry (connected with his control over land), and conducted game activities (for military preparedness). While the chief is still the repository of such power, he seldom takes an active part in granting or withholding rights of this kind. These rights have tended to become fixed within the smaller segments of the lineage, in the two-generational or, at most, the three-generational branches. In many cases, these are extended-family groupings. For example, if one's grandfather and father farmed a certain section of land on the reservation, one would not have to validate his rights to this land before the chief or even before a council of elders, provided there was no serious contest among heirs which called for lineage arbitration.

Much the same may be said for other rights enjoyed by a man's sons. These are indeed birth rights, theoretically subject to approval by the responsible members of the lineage, headed by the chief, but actually passing from father to son, free from infringement by kinsmen who are not one's immediate family. There are sufficient exceptions to this *de facto* condition, however, to indicate that on occasion the traditional powers vested in the lineage may be brought into play, and that the chief is more than the mere titular head of the community. The chief is a spokesman for the localized lineage, and among all the elders he has the greatest authority. But by and large these lineage-based powers are seldom activated, and the inheritance system, as one example, operates in seeming independence of lineage machinery, as long as one household does not infringe seriously on the rights of others. This is an indication of the smoothness with which the lineage system functions.

When we move into the sphere of Mapuche morality,